



DOC FILE COPY

Graduate School of Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

80 1 - 9 067

Factors and Perceived

The Influence of Personal Factors and Perceived
Work Experiences on Employee
Turnover and Absenteeism

Daniel G. Spencer School of Business University of Kansas

Richard M. Steers
Graduate School of Management
University of Oregon

Technical Report No. 21

November 1979

Principal Investigators

Richard M. Steers, University of Oregon Richard T. Mowday, University of Oregon Lyman W. Porter, University of California, Irvine

Prepared under ONR Contract N00014-76-C-0164

NR 170-812

Distribution of this document is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

	RT DOCUMENTATION	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM			
1. REPORT NUMBER	/	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER		
Technical Rep	t No. 21				
4 TITLE Tond Substitutes			5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED		
1 The Influence	of Personal Factors	and Domantund	İ		
7	es on Employee Turn				
Absenteeism .	. a on maployee full	over and	6 PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER		
·					
7 AUTHOR(s)			8 CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)		
Daniel C./Spend	er , and Richard M./	Steers. \ //	NØØ014-76-C-0164		
(Transmit In	W. Perre	Article Carrier		
PENFORMING DRUANT	ATION I AND ADDRESS	10 PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK			
The second section is a second	and the same of	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS			
Graduate School	9	NR 170-812			
University of (1 1		
Fugene, Oregon	C NAME AND ADDRESS		PE REPORT DATE		
Organizational	Effectiveness Rese	arch 1	/ November 1979 /		
Office of Naval		\	13. NUMBER OF PAGES		
			12 pages 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)		
14 MONITOHING AGENCY	NAME & ADDRESS(II dilleren	r from Controlling Office;	1		
			Unclassified		
			15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		
			SCHEDULE		
16 DISTRIUCTION STATE	MENT (of this Report)				
Distribution of part is permitt	this document is ed for any purpose	unlimited. Repr of the United S	roduction in whole or in States Government.		
Distribution of part is permitt	this document is ed for any purpose	unlimited. Repr of the United S	States Government.		
part is permitt	this document is ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accession For		
part is permitt	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For STIS STILL D		
part is permitt	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accession For		
part is permitt	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accessics For		
part is permitt 7. DISTRIBUTION STATE	ed for any purpose	of the United S	Accession For STIS STILL DE S		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO	ed for any purpose	e of the United S	Accession For STIS STILL DE STILL ST		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism	TES TES TES Con reverse aide (I necessary and Education Group Attitudes	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from the In Block 20, 11 different from the Indiana from the Indian	Accessics For Accessics For STIS STATE ACCESSICS FOR ACCESSICS FOR STIS STATE ACCESSICS FOR ACCESS		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO Turnover Absenteeism Tenure	TES On reverse aide (I necessary and Education Group Attitudes Met expectation	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from the In Block 20, 11 different from the Indiana from the Indian	Accessics For Accessics For STIS STATE ACCESSICS FOR ACCESSICS FOR STIS STATE ACCESSICS FOR ACCESS		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism	TES TES TES Con reverse aide (I necessary and Education Group Attitudes	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from the In Block 20, 11 different from the Indiana from the Indian	Accession For Accession For STIS STATE ACCESSION FOR ACCESSION		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age	TES TES Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge	of the United S In Block 20, II different fro In didentify by block number Organization Personal imp	Accession For Accession For STIS DATA ACCESSION FOR ACCESSION FOR STIS DATA ACCESSION FOR ACCESSI		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue)	TES TES TES TO reverse alde if necessary and Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge	of the United S in Block 20, II different fro didentify by block number Organization Personal imp	Accessics For NTIS NTIS NAME OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue) lative influence turnover and abse	MENT (at the abstract entered TES TES Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor entee ism among a sa	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from Block 20, 11 different from Block 20, 11 different from Block number Personal imports and perceived mple of 200 cler	Accessics For Accessics For Office Report) On Report (Report) On Report) On Report (Report)		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue) lative influence turnover and abse major hospital.	TES TES TES TES TO reverse aide if necessary and Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor enteeism among a sa It was found that	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from Block 20, 11 different from Block number Organization Personal imposes and perceived mple of 200 cler turnover and abs	Accessics For Accessics For WIS This paper examined the re- work experiences on employee rical and service workers in senteeism represent largely		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue) lative influence turnover and absente independent behave	TES TES TO reverse aide (I necessary and Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor enteeism among a sailt was found that viors. Moreover, a	of the United Son Block 20, 11 different from Block 20, 11 different from Bornal important from Personal important properties and perceived mple of 200 cler turnover and absolute though personal	Accessics For Out Report) Out and dependability Out ance This paper examined the re- work experiences on employees rical and service workers in senteeism represent largely factors predicted absenteei		
19 KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20 ABSTRACT (Continue) lative influence turnover and abse major hospital. independent behav better than perce	Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor enteeism among a sa It was found that	of the United Solo of the United	Accessics For WIS This paper examined the rework experiences on employee rical and service workers in senteeism represent largely factors predicted absenteei redictive trends were found		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue lative influence turnover and absente independent behave better than perces for turnover. Re	Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor enteeism among a sa It was found that	of the United Solo of the United	Accessics For WIS WALL WIS TO THE POOR Report) This paper examined the rework experiences on employee rical and service workers in senteeism represent largely factors predicted absenteei		
part is permitt 17. DISTRIBUTION STATE 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NO 19. KEY WORDS (Continue) Turnover Absenteeism Tenure Age 20. ABSTRACT (Continue) lative influence turnover and absente independent behave better than perce	Education Group Attitudes Met expectation Job challenge of personal factor enteeism among a sa It was found that	of the United Solo of the United	Accessics For WIS This paper examined the rework experiences on employee rical and service workers in senteeism represent largely factors predicted absenteei redictive trends were found		

DD FORM 1473 EDITION OF I NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102 LF 014 6601

Unclassified
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)	
	}
	j
	Ì
	1
]
	j
	Ì
	1
	ļ
	İ
	j
	1
	1
	}

The Influence of Personal Factors and Perceived Work

Experiences on Employee Turnover and Absenteeism

A review of the literature on employee turnover and absenteeism indicates fairly clearly that most studies on the topic utilize bivariate rather than multivariate analyses, and examine only one form of withdrawal behavior (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Muchinsky, 1977). As a result, little is known about the relative influence of major sets of antecedents on turnover and absenteeism. It is the intent of this study to examine the relative influence of two major sets of antecedents on both forms of withdrawal behavior. These two sets are personal factors and the work experiences of employees. In the literature, considerable emphasis tends to be placed on identifying work-related influences (including work experiences) on withdrawal processes with little consideration of whether or not such influences do, in fact, represent a major influence on turnover and absenteeism (Mowday, Porter, & Stone, 1979). Hence, it is useful to compare the predictive powers of such variables to the influence of personal characteristics of the employees themselves.

The selection of these two sets of variables is partly in response to an hypothesis suggested by Nicholson, Brown, and Chadwick-Jones (1976) that work experiences do not have a substantial influence on withdrawal behavior. Based on their study, Nicholson et al. commented that "the common view of absence as a pain reductive response on the part of the worker to his work experience is naive, narrow and empirically unsupportable" (1976, p. 735). At present, there is little information available regarding which set of influences, personal factors or work experiences, is relatively more important. It seems logical, therefore, to explore this issue further by examining both sets of antecedents simultaneously.

Personal characteristics examined in this paper include: age, tenure in the organization, tenure in position, sex, and education. These variables were selected for study because of their purported importance in employee withdrawal behavior (Nicholson, Brown, & Chadwick-Jones, 1977; Nicholson & Goodge, 1976). Five work experience perceptions were examined in the present study (after Buchanan, 1974). These are: (1) group attitudes toward the organization, i.e., the extent to which one's peers had positive or negative attitudes toward their employer; (2) met expectations, i.e., the extent to which one's expectations concerning organizational life have been met on the job; (3) job challenge, i.e., the ability of the organization to provide challenging and stimulating work assignments, (4) personal importance to the organization, i.e., personal feelings that the employee is making real contributions to the organization; and (5) organizational dependability, i.e., a stable flow of expected inducements from the organization to employees. All of these work experiences represent perceptions of having undergone a particular class of experience in the work environment (see Buchanan for detailed discussion).

The work experiences chosen for analysis represent the most important indicators of organizational commitment in Buchanan's (1974) study. Since current evidence indicates that organizational commitment is predictive of withdrawal from the organization (Steers, 1977), each of the above work experiences were good candidates for inclusion into this analysis of withdrawal behavior. Relationships between these work experiences, as measured by Buchanan's instrument, and turnover and absenteeism have not been previously examined.

METHOD

Sample and Research Site

This study was carried out among a sample of 200 clerical and service workers of a major midwestern hospital. Average age of the subjects was about

37, while the average tenure was about seven years. Educational backgrounds were primarily high school degrees.

Research Instruments

<u>Personal characteristics</u> -- Subjects supplied information on questionnaires concerning their tenure in the organization, tenure in position, sex, age, and educational attainment.

Work Experiences -- The five work experience variables which characterize the job situation were measured using the instrument developed by Buchanan (1974). Each scale (described above) is represented by several items measured on seven-point Likert scales. Internal consistencies of the five scales ranged from .64 to .80, using coefficient alpha.

Turnover and absenteeism -- Turnover data were collected for one year after questionnaire administration. During this period 17% of the sample turned over. Absenteeism was measured as the number of days absent from work over a nine-month period.

Data Collection

Questionnaires were administered on-site by university researchers during regular working hours. Subjects were informed that participation was voluntary and were assured confidentiality of responses. Of the initial random sample, questionnaire data were collected from 87%. Thus, the resulting sample size upon which the analyses were based was 200. Absenteeism data were available for only 124 subjects in the sample.

PESULTS

Initially, concern focused on examining the extent to which various sets of variables were interrelated. Pearson product-moment correlations between study variables revealed a median r = .12 between the various personal factors,

a median \underline{r} = .57 between the various work experiences, and a median \underline{r} = .16 between personal factors and work experiences. Due to the high intercorrelation among the work experiences, partial correlations were used for purposes of analysis, as described below. Finally, turnover and absenteeism were found to be unrelated (\underline{r} = .06).

Multivariate Analysis

First, correlating sets of <u>both</u> personal characteristics and work experiences with withdrawal behavior yeilded multiple Rs = .33 and .42, respectively, for turnover and absenteeism, indicating that these factors when taken together do indeed significantly influence withdrawal behavior. These results compare favorably with earlier findings (e.g., Garrison & Muchinsky, 1977) even though the magnitude is not particularly strong, suggesting the existence of other factors (e.g., reward systems) that also influence withdrawal. Results are shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Second, when multiple correlations were run separately for personal characteristics and work experiences and subsequent turnover and absenteeism it was found that antecedents of absenteeism were different than those for turnover. Personal characteristics were significantly associated with absenteeism (R = .35, p < .05), but not turnover (R = .20, N.S.). On the other hand work experiences were significantly associated with turnover (R = .29, p < .05) but not absentable is R = .30, N.S.). The magnitude of prediction for work experiences and both forms of withdrawal, however, was the same. Williams tests (Williams, 1959) show that one particular equation was not significantly more predictive than another prediction equation for each dependent variable.

The contribution of each set of influences to explained variance above

and beyond that of the other set was obtained by decomposing the multivariate relationships provided in Table 1 (using the procedure of Cohen & Cohen, 1975). With regard to the prediction of absenteeism, R is increased by .12 with the addition of personal characteristics to work experiences (a significant increase, p < .05); the addition of work experiences to personal characteristics results in an increase of only .07 (not significant). With regard to the prediction of turnover, R is increased by .13 with the addition of work experiences to personal characteristics; the addition of personal characteristics to work experiences results in an increase of only .04. Both increases are not statistically significant.

Bivariate Analysis

In order to provide further information regarding which factors most closely relate to turnover and absenteeism and to replicate the simple bivariate analyses one typically finds in the literature for comparative purposes, bivariate correlations were computed for each personal characteristic and work experience separately with each measure of withdrawal behavior. Results are shown in Table 1.

Simple Pearson product-moment correlations for each of the sets of measures show little consistent relationship between personal characteristics and turnover and absenteeism. On the other hand, there is a consistent relationship between each of the work experiences and both forms of withdrawal. In order to correct for common methods variance, fourth order partial correlation coefficients were computed for work experiences partialling out the effects of all other work experiences. These same procedures were used for personal characteristics. Results in Table 1 show that the number of significant work experience predictors decreased drammatically and the number of significant personal characteristic predictors increased, especially for absenteeism.

After partial correlation, only one personal characteristic, that of sex, was significantly related to both turnover and absenteeism. Males had higher turnover rates than females. In addition, both forms of tenure and age were all related to absenteeism, but not turnover. Such findings are consistent with Nicholson et al. (1977). No other personal characteristics were related to turnover.

With regard to the relationships of individual work experiences with turnover and absenteeism, only the partial correlation between experienced organizational dependability and turnover was significant, while only the partial correlation between experienced job challenge and absenteeism was significant. These findings would be expected from theory (Buchanan, 1974; Steers & Rhodes, 1978).

DISCUSSION

The focus of this study has been exploratory in nature. The relationship between two major sets of determinants of withdrawal behavior, personal characteristics and work related experiences, have been examined as they relate to turnover and absenteeism. With respect to the findings of this study, several interesting conclusions emerged. First, it was found that turnover and absenteeism were relatively independent. This supports Porter and Steers (1973) contention that turnover and absenteeism are distinct behaviors in need of separate attention.

Second, it was determined that absenteeism was better predicted by personal factors than work experiences, while no clear trend emerged for turnover in terms of relative predictive power. Thus, for this particular sample of hospital employees, turnover behavior is distinguished from absenteeism in terms of the antecedents of each behavior, especially with respect to personal characteristic antecedents. With respect to work experiences, perceived organizational dependability was significantly related to turnover but not absenteeism. Conversely,

job challenge was significantly related to absenteeism but not turnover.

of particular note is the inverse relationships between age and absenteeism and tenure and absenteeism. Such a pattern would not normally be expected. This leads us to agree with the recent conclusion of Muchinsky (1977) that there is a great amount of inconsistency in this research. Muchinsky postulates that the reason for such disparate results in the absenteeism literature is probably due to the myriad of different ways absenteeism is measured. However, when one closely examines the review of the literature by Rhodes and Steers (1978), which includes information on the types of absenteeism measures used, one finds that results are still inconsistent within different measures of absenteeism. Forhaps inconsistent results are not only due to the type of absenteeism measure used but also a function of type of sample used and/or level of aggregation used. Or, perhaps inconsistent relationships are due to the fact that underlying causal variables of absenteeism have not yet been identified. These same notions may apply to the study of turnover as well.

Overall, the results of this study support the contention of Nicholson et al. (1977) and Nicholson and Goodge (1976) that personal characteristics are superior predictors of absence behavior when compared to work experiences. It also supports Nicholson et al.'s (1976) contention that absence behavior is probably not a pain reductive response on the part of the worker to work experience. The results of the study further suggest that turnover may be the more likely candidate for being the pain reductive response on the part of the worker to his or her work experience, although this is speculative based on available data.

In summary, personal characteristics exhibited a higher correlation with absenteeism than turnover, while work experiences had correlations of similar magnitude with absenteeism and turnover. These results point to the importance of using multivariate and comparative analyses in the study of withdrawal

behavior. In particular, the results using partial correlations cautions against the proliferation of simple bivariate correlations. Moreover, the differential results for turnover and absenteeism emphasizes the need for more comparative studies. Further efforts in these directions should add measurably to our existing level of knowledge of withdrawal processes in organizations and will hopefully contribute useful information to managers interested in controlling both types of behavior.

LOOTNOTES

1 The research reported here was supported by funds provided under ONR Contract N00014-76-C-0164, NR 170-812. The comments of Richard T. Mowday on an earlier draft are greatly appreciated. Requests for reprints should be sent to Daniel G. Spencer, School of Business, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045.

REFERENCES

- Buchanan, B. Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 1974, 19, 533-546.
- 2. Cohen, J., and Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analyses

 for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1975.
- Garrison, K.R., and Muchinsky, P.M. Attitudinal and biographical predictors
 of incidental absenteeism. <u>Journal of Vocational Behavior</u>, 1977, 10,
 221-230.
- 4. Mobley, W.H., Griffeth, R.W., Hand, H.H., and Meglino, B.M. Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. <u>Psychological</u> Bulletin, 1979, 86, 493-521.
- 5. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., and Stone, E.F. Employee characteristics as predictors of turnover among female clerical employees in two organizations.

 Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1979, 12, 321-332.
- 6. Muchinsky, P.M. Employee absenteeism: A review of the literature. <u>Journal</u> of Vocational Behavior, 1977, 10, 316-340.
- 7. Nicholson, N., Brown, C.A., and Chadwick-Jones, J.K. Absence from work and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 728-737.
- 8. Nicholson, N., Brown, C.A., and Chadwick-Jones, J.K. Absence from work and personal characteristics. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1977, 62, 319-327.
- 9. Nicholson, N., and Goodge, P.M. The influence of social, organizational, and biographical factors on female absence. <u>Journal of Management Studies</u>, 1976, 13, 234-254.
- 10. Porter, L.W., and Steers, R.M. Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1973, 30, 161-176.

- 11. Rhodes, S.R., and Steers, R.M. Summary tables of studies of employee absenteeism. Technical Report No. 13, Office of Naval Research, Graduate School of Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1978.
- 12. Steers, R.M. Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment.

 Administrative Science Quarterly, 1977, 22, 46-56.
- 13. Steers, R.M., and Rhodes, S.R. Major influences on employee attendance:
 A process model. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1978, 63, 391-407.
- 14. Williams, E.J. Regression Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1959.

TABLE 1
Simple and Partial Correlations Between Personal Characteristics
and Work Experiences and Turnover and Absenteeism

	Turnover		Absenteeism	
	Simple $\underline{\mathbf{r}}$	Partial <u>r</u>	Simple <u>r</u>	Partial <u>r</u>
Personal Characteristics				
Tenure in Organization	10	08	.16**	.34**
Tenure in Position	06	.03	12	23**
Sex	14*	12*	.13	18*
Age	06	.02	17*	23**
Education	.13	.11	.07	01
^R PC	.20		· <u>35</u> *	
Work Experiences				
Group Attitudes	18**	04	16*	03
Met Expectations	18**	.01	15*	.04
Job Challenge	18**	07	23**	15%
Personal Importance	14*	.03	23**	13
Organizational Dependability	23**	12*	16*	.01
R _{WE}	· <u>29</u> *)	.30	
R _{PC} + WE	.33		.42*	

^{* &}lt;u>p</u> < .05

^{** &}lt;u>p</u> < .01

P4-5/A1 Sequencial by Agency 452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 1 MANDATORY

Defense Documentation Center (12 copies)

ATTN: DDC-TC

Accessions Division Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314

Library of Congress

Science and Technology Division

Washington, DC 20540

Chief of Naval Research Office of Naval Research (3 copies)

Code 452

800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217

Commanding Officer

Naval Research Laboratory

Code 2627

Washington, DC 20375

(6 copies)

P4-5/A3 Sequencial by State/City 452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 2 ONR FIELD

Commanding Officer ONR Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadena, CA 91106

Psychologist ONR Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadena, CA 91106

Commanding Officer ONR Branch Office 536 S. Clark Street Chicago, IL 60605

Psychologist ONR Branch Office 536 S. Clark Street Chicago, IL 60605

Commanding Officer ONR Branch Office Bldg. 114, Section D 666 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
Bldg. 114, Section D
666 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210

Office of Naval Research Director, Technology Programs Code 200 80(N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217 LIST 3 OPNAV

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training) Scientific Advisor to DCNO (Op-OlT) 2705 Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training) Director, Human Resource Management Division (Op-15) Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training) Head, Research, Development, and Studies Branch (Op-102) 1812 Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training) Director, Human Resource Management Plans and Policy Branch (Op-150) Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations
Head, Manpower, Personnel, Training
and Reserves Team (Op-964D)
The Pentagon, 4A578
Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations Assistant, Personnel Logistics Planning (Op-987P10) The Pentagon, 5D772 Washington, DC 20350

452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 4 NAVMAT & NPRDC

NAVMAT

Naval Material Command
Program Administrator, Manpower,
Personnel, and Training
Code 08T244
1044 Crystal Plaza #5
Washington, DC 20360

Naval Material Command
Management Training Center
NMAT 09M32
Jefferson Plaza, Bldg #2, Rm 150
1421 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 20360

NPRDC

Commanding Officer Naval Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 (5 Copies)

Navy Personnel R&D Center Washington Liaison Office Building 200, 2N Washington Navy Yard Washington, DC 20374

452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 6 NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Naval Postgraduate School ATTN: Dr. Richard S. Elster Department of Administrative Sciences Monterey, CA 93940

Naval Postgraduate School ATTN: Professor John Senger Operations Research and Administrative Science Monterey, CA 93940

Superintendent Naval Postgraduate School Code 1424 Monterey, CA 93940 LIST 7 HRM

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment Nav 1 Air Station Alameda, CA 94591

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment Naval Submarine Base New London P.O. Box 81 Groton, CT 06340

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Division Naval Air Station Mayport, FL 32228

Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center Pearl Harbor, HI 96860

Commander in Chief Human Resource Management Division U.S. Pacific Fleet Pearl Harbor, HI 96860

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment Naval Base Charleston, SC 29408

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis
Millington, TN 38054

Human Resource Management School Naval Air Station Memphis (96) Millington, TN 38054 List 7 (Continued)

Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209

Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center 5621-23 Tidewater Drive Norfolk, VA 23511

Commander in Chief Human Resource Management Division U.S. Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, VA 23511

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Naval Air Station Ehidbey Island
Oak Harbor, WA 98278

Commanding Officer Human Resource Management Center Box 23 FPO New York 09510

Commander in Chief Human Resource Management Division U.S. Naval Force Europe FPO New York 09510

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment Box 60 FPO San Francisco 96651

Officer in Charge Human Resource Management Detachment COMMAVFORJAPAN FPO Seattle 98762

452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 9 USMC

Commandant of the Marine Corps Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps Code MPI-20 Washington, DC 20380

Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps ATTN: Dr. A. L. Slafkosky, Code RD-1 Washington, DC 20380

452:KD:716:abc 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 12 ARMY

Army Research Institute Field Unit - Monterey P.O. Box 5787 Monterey, CA 93940

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Research Office ATTN: DAPE-PBR Washington, DC 20310

Headquarters, FORSCOM ATTN: AFPR-HR Ft. McPherson, GA 30330

Army Research Institute Field Unit - Leavenworth P.O. Box 3122 Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

Technical Director Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333 (2 copies)

452:KD:716:abc 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 13 AIR FORCE

Air University Library/LSE 76-443 Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

AFOSR/NL (Dr. Fregly) Building 410 Bolling AFB Washington, DC 20332

Air Force Institute of Technology AFIT/LSGR (Lt. Col. Umstot) Wright-Patterson AFB Dayton, OH 45433

Technical Director AFHRL/ORS Brooks AFB San Antonio, TX 78235

AFMPC/DPMYP (Research and Measurement Division) Randolph AFB Universal City, TX 78148

452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 15 CURRENT CONTRACTORS

Dr. Clayton P. Alderfer School of Organization and Management Yale University New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. H. Russell Bernard
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Dr. Arthur Blaiwes Human Factors Laboratory, Code N-71 Naval Training Equipment Center Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Michael Borus Ohio State University Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. Joseph V. Brady
The Johns Hopkins University
School of Medicine
Division of Behavioral Biology
Baltimore, MD 21205

Mr. Frank Clark
ADTECH/Advanced Technology, Inc.
7923 Jones Branch Drive, Suite 500
McLean, VA 22102

Dr. Stuart W. Cook University of Colorado Institute of Behavioral Science Boulder, CO 80309

Mr. Gerald M. Croan
Westinghouse National Issues
Center
Suite 1111
2341 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

LIST 15 (Continued)

Dr. Larry Cummings
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Graduate School of Business
Center for the Study of
Organizational Performance
1155 Observatory Drive
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. John P. French, Jr. University of Michigan Institute for Social Research P.O. Box 1248 Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Dr. Paul S. Goodman
Graduate School of Industrial
Administration
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. J. Richard Hackman School of Organization and Management Yale University 56 Hillhouse Avenue New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Asa G. Hilliard, Jr. The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc. P.O. Box 15068
San Francisco, CA 94115

Dr. Charles L. Hulin Department of Psychology University of Illinois Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Edna J. Hunter
United States International
University
School of Human Behavior
P.O. Box 26110
San Diego, CA 92126

Dr. Rudi Klauss
Syracuse University
Public Administration Department
Maxwell School
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Judi Komaki Georgia Institute of Technology Engineering Experiment Station Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Edward E. Lawler Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers P.O. Box 5395 4000 N.E., 41st Street Seattle, WA 98105

Dr. Edwin A. Locke
University of Maryland
College of Business and Management
and Department of Psychology
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Ben Morgan
Performance Assessment
Laboratory
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA 23508

Dr. Richard T. Mowday
Graduate School of Management
and Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. Joseph Olmstead Human Resources Research Organization 300 North Washington Street Alexandria, VA 22314 Dr. Thomas M. Ostrom
The Ohio State University
Department of Psychology
116E Stadium
404C West 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. George E. Rowland Temple University, The Merit Center Ritter Annex, 9th Floor College of Education Philadephia, PA 19122

Dr. Irwin G. Sarason University of Washington Department of Psychology Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Benjamin Schneider Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824

Dr. Saul B. Sells Texas Christian University Institute of Behavioral Research Drawer C Fort Worth, TX 76129

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Program Director, Manpower Research
and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
801 N. Pitt Street, Suite 120
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Richard Steers
Graduate School of Management
and Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

P4-5/B8 Sequencial by Principal Investigator 452:KD:716:tam 78u452-883 6 November 1979

LIST 16 MANPOWER R&D CONTRACTORS

Dr. Vincent Carroll University of Pennsylvania Wharton Applied Research Center Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dr. William H. Mobley University of South Carolina College of Business Administration Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Richard Morey
Duke University
Graduate School of Business
Administration
Durham, NC 27706

Dr. Al Rhode Information Spectrum, Inc. 1745 S. Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202

Dr. Lee Sechrest Florida State University Department of Psychology Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Donald Wise MATHTECH, Inc. P.O. Box 2392 Princeton, NJ 08540